

Appl. No. 09/982,271
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2005

Docket No. CM01968G
Customer No. 22917

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have amended Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15 and 17 and have added a new Claim 18. No new matter was added by these amendments. Claims 1-13 and 15-18 remain in the application.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-13, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Popovic (USPN 6,091,761) and has rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popovic (USPN 6,091,761). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the clarifying limitations of "*sampling a received composite signal comprising transmissions from a plurality of source devices to generate a plurality of original samples. . . ; reordering the original samples . . . ; and performing a transform on the re-ordered original samples.*" Similarly, Claim 9 has been amended to include the clarifying limitations of "*a receiver for receiving original samples of a composite signal comprising transmissions from a plurality of source devices; a linear feedback shift register state machine for generating a sequence of addresses . . . ; a storage medium. . . for storing each of the original samples . . . according to the sequence of addresses; and a processor . . . for directly performing a transform on at least a portion of the original samples.*"

Popovic does not disclose the above-quoted limitations from Claims 1 and 9. Instead Popovic discloses multiplication functions that change the original samples of a received signal. In one embodiment of Popovic, a multiplication function is applied to the original received signal samples to generate products and then the products (not the original samples) are reordered, which is different from recitations in Claims 1 and 9. In another embodiment of Popovic, a multiplication function is applied to the reordered samples and a transform is applied to the reordered products, instead of to the reordered original samples as recited in Claim 1 or to the original samples stored according to the sequence of addresses as recited in Claim 9.

For these reasons, Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

Appl. No. 09/982,271
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2005

Docket No. CM01968G
Customer No. 22917

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

Attachments

By: 

Valerie M. Davis
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: 847-576-6733
Fax No.: 847-576-0721